The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
29 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. I
No. 3

JULY
1912

Why Suffrage Fails in Colorado

Attacking Miss Tarbell a Suffragist Pastime

Suffrage and Non-Suffrage State Laws

Women Win Victory in New Hampshire

National Conventions and The Woman Question

Judge Timlin, of Wisconsin, on Suffrage

Subscription, $1.00 a Year **Single copies, 10 cents**

[Entered as second-class matter May 1, 1912, at the postoffice at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary, Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley, Hartford, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. William A. Putnam, New York.
Mrs. C. F. Corbin, Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. J. F. Bailey, Portland, Oregon.
Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Frank Goodwin, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard, Columbus, O.
Miss Anna Dayton, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherford, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Edson J. Hill, New Hampshire.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT.

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Charles C. Beach, Miss Martha J. Wilkinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cook.
Secretary, Mrs. John L. Bunce, 45 Sumner Street, Hartford.

ILLINOIS.

President, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. S. M. Nickerson, Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, Mrs. James M. Walker, Mrs. T. B. Blackstone.
Treasurer, Miss J. C. Fairfield, Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. George W. Kretzinger.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MAINE COMMITTEE.

Secretary, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland; Mrs. Charles S. Ogden, Mrs. James P. Baxter, Mrs. Clarence H. Corning, Mrs. F. A. Quimby, Miss Louisa Spring, Miss Catherine P. Talbot, Miss Hannah L. Talbot, Miss Mary King Longfellow, Miss Elinor S. Moody, Miss Marion Richmond Weeks, Mrs. John M. Glidden, Newcastle; Mrs. P. M. Blake, Bangor; Mrs. F. C. Robinson, Brunswick.

MARYLAND.

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. P. Thompson Coyle, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Hobart Duvall.
Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Latimer.
Secretary, Miss Catherine M. Selfe.

MASSACHUSETTS.

President, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Room 615 Kensington Building, Boyleston Street, Boston.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION.

President, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas C. Bethume, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY.

President, Miss Anna Dayton.
Secretary, Miss Fanny Dickinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles Minnegorode, 192 West State Street, Trenton.

NEW YORK STATE.

President, Mrs. William A. Putnam.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis, 29 West 39th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charlton T. Lewis.

OHIO.

President, Mrs. Hermon M. Hubbard.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. W. W. Clippinger, Madisonville; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta.
Treasurer, Miss Alice B. Haney.
Secretary, Miss F. Ewing Martin, Room 332 Chamber of Commerce Building, Columbus.

OREGON.

President, Mrs. Francis J. Bailey, Bowers Hotel, Portland.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Failing, Mrs. R. W. Wilbur.
Treasurer, Mrs. Wallace McCamant.
Secretary, Miss Eleanor E. Gile.

PENNSYLVANIA.

President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Sophy D. Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. William L. McLean, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Miss Elise Balch.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Brinton Coxe, 1515 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.

RHODE ISLAND.

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha Howard.
Secretary, Mrs. Albert Harkness.

VIRGINIA.

President, Miss Jane M. Rutherford.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas Cary Johnson, Mrs. Charles Whitlock, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Arthur Wilmer.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, 1616 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

President, Mrs. Frank Goodwin.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Miss Jane Riggs, Miss Mollie Elliot Seawell, Mrs. George Wickersham, Miss Grace Denio Litchfield.
Treasurer, Miss McMullen.
Secretary, Mrs. Kingsbury Waterman, 1311 New Hampshire Avenue.

WISCONSIN.

Madison Branch.

President, Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph W. Hobbins.
Secretary, Miss G. M. Mills, 222 Monona Avenue, Madison.

Feminists and Females.

III.—"BACK TO NATURE."

BY HAROLD OWEN.

Before we come to consider the facts of natural science upon which the doctrine that all women should work for their living is based, it is necessary to take notice of what at first sight appears to be a divergence between suffragism and feminism. For whereas the feminist attacks the existing order all along the line because the woman is parasitically dependent on man, one of the bases of suffragism is that all women cannot be dependent on man. And so suffragism confronts us with the question: "It is all very well to say that women can depend on their husbands, but that is only true of four out of five or five out of six. What are you going to do about the sixth woman?"

And if you should answer, as some might, "Well, I am not at the moment prepared to say what should be done with her, but at any rate she reduces the problem to something like manageable proportions"—thereupon the suffragist and feminist both speak in the same voice again, and the suffragist adopts the feminist's view. And her view, of course, is that the other five or six should be reduced to the same independent (that is, self-dependent) position as the odd fifth or sixth. If she is dependent on her own exertions, all the others shall be braced up with the same tonic. And so the economic independence of woman is elevated to a positive ideal, and suffragism and feminism flow in the same stream again.

THE DEPENDENT WOMAN.

But it is obviously a difficult task to persuade the other five that it is to their interest to be reduced to the dependent condition of the sixth. For each one of the five may say, "I may be a parasite or a serf, though that is not the way I have looked at it, but even if I am I like it!" And such contumacious obstinacy in fundamental error has to be met.

The feminist is equal to the emergency, for all she has to do is to disgust the dependent woman with her dependence, and to show her that even though she may be content to be a parasite, she is an unnatural parasite, totally unlike anything else in creation, and that, moreover, she is not even a happy parasite. For this purpose, the feminist has a double barreled gun. With one barrel she discharges the facts of natural science at the dependent woman's head, and with the other she shatters all the illusions concerning home, marriage and husband, just as she has shattered all illusions concerning wifehood, and shown it to be a condition of servile parasitism.

Miss Cicely Hamilton (and, in fact, most feminists) uses both barrels. As she says: "The fundamental natural laws which govern us are the same large and simple laws which govern other animals, man included." And the "parasitical" view of the wives of England taken by feminists rests, indeed, upon a scientific and absolutely incontrovertible fact of nature that no anti-suffragist or other unenlightened person can possibly deny. Mrs. Gilman, one of the leading American feminists, from whom our own feminists have drawn much inspiration, is a very patient exponent of this fact. And, as she truly tells us, "We are the only animal species in which the female depends on the male for food, the only animal species in which the sex-relation is also an economic relation. . . . In no case (in the animal kingdom) is the female supported throughout her life by the male.

ANIMAL IDEALS.

That is perfectly and triumphantly true. So we may see that the parasitical status of the wife, which feminism has discovered, is condemned and repudiated by the scientific researches they have made. It has no sanction whatever from the high examples set to us by the lower animals. And, indeed, a moment's reflection will show you, to take one of the many illustrations that Mrs. Gilman herself furnishes that the tom-cat, for instance, does not have to maintain a wife in a state of parasitism. He is gloriously and promiscuously free in his amours, robs no wife of her independence, and degrades no she cat whatever to a parasitical or servile level.

And so it is manifest that the human male and female — man and woman — have grievously departed from the exalted example set to them by tom-cats and lady cats. The human "tom" (if I may debase a feline appellation by applying it to so vile a creature as man) has evolved, through the long and shameful process known as civilization, the conception of home and family, and other ignoble attributes of his civilized degradation and fall. And the consequence is that the human female, so far from realizing the glorious ideal of emancipated womanhood which the lady cat teaches her, if she would but learn, no longer exercises economic independence (as Mrs. Gilman says, "the common cat" feeds herself), but lives in a state of parasitic dependence upon a tyrannical monogamous "husband," who makes use of his "economic independence" to maintain her.

Now, this disgusting state of affairs has only arisen in our species because the world is ruled by man. He it is who has degraded the human female in this shameful manner, and feminism is calling upon womanhood to rise, and to return to a state of nature, and to follow the high example set to it by the lady cat. But, as an unheated observer of the whole controversy, perhaps I may be allowed to say a word in his defense. I recognize his crime, but merely want to say a word in mitigation of sentence by pointing out the motive—the mistaken and unworthy motive—from which that degraded creature has so acted.

MAN AND THE TOM-CAT.

He has assumed that one reason why the human female is the only animal female dependent upon her male—for nowhere else does the animal kingdom furnish us with any practise so degrading—is that nowhere else is such a being as the human female found in the animal kingdom. There is that excuse to be made for him. Being a creature of imperfect intelligence, blind egoism and wholly selfish instincts, he has conceived the notion that men and women are really superior animals to tom-cats and lady cats, and he has regarded himself as a civilizable animal.

He has further become the victim of the curious notion that his race, being superior to dogs and ducks and foxes and fishes, could only be properly nurtured and reared under a system of division of labor which threw upon him the duty of providing for the human female and the human young (or, as he despicably calls them, "wife" and "child") and left to him the supremely important duty (as he, in his egoism, has conceived it) of attending to her and its as well as his domestic wants in a fearful hole which he has the temerity to call "a home." So much for the first barrel.

And the second barrel contains what feminism has to say of him and home and things like that. For feminism reveals to us in many a blinding flash of enlightenment what sort of a place "home" is. The she cat, as we all know, fulfils her beautiful instinct of maternity unhampered by any subsequent degrading interference from the male in the way of "maintenance." She keeps her troubles to herself, in a gloriously emancipated and economically independent fashion, and, if she is majestically wild, takes to the woods; and if she is "economically dependent" upon a man-made "home," as these curious places are called, she finds a cupboard.

But contrast with that elevated simplicity the lot of the human female—the wife, the parasite. Her independence (as we all must admit) is complicated, baffled and degraded at every turn by the unwholesome associations of what man, in his arrogance, calls a "husband" and "home." And so the next thing to do is to discover what feminism thinks of those beastly institutions, and how it intends to improve them by a new morality.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Owen's articles are appearing first in The London Daily Chronicle. They have attracted so much attention that they are well worth repeating. One of these articles will appear with each issue of "THE WOMAN'S PROTEST."

The following articles by Mr. Owen are yet to be presented: "The 'Live Your Own Life' Creed" and "And the Newest Morality."

Judge Timlin, of Wisconsin Supreme Court, Presents Reasons Against the Vote for Woman

Jurist Points Out How the Wrongs of Such a System Would Outweigh by Far the Alleged Advantages.

The Hon. William H. Timlin, Judge of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, recently delivered at Milwaukee an excellent address against woman suffrage, from which we quote the following:

"With your permission I shall address myself to that problem of citizenship which you will encounter sharply on November 5th, when you will be called upon to cast your ballot to decide whether Chapter 227 of the Laws of Wisconsin for 1911 shall go into effect or not. This is the statute which extends the right to vote to every person, male and female, of the age of twenty-one years and upward. This proposes an extraordinary social change and deserves your earnest and thoughtful consideration. We cannot fully appreciate the problem unless we keep in mind the system of representative republican government based upon sovereignty of the electors which here exists. We get no light from the lamp of experience, for in all the past no such thing has been attempted. It cannot be determined upon a mere comparison of male and female intelligence.

"I believe women are the intellectual equals of man. In some things they are much superior. But the intellectual qualities of the man and woman do not cover the same field, have the same view point, or have the same degree of independence of the emotions. There is a feminism of intellect apparent in art and literature, easier to recognize and identify than to define. It is better adapted to the love and sympathy and solicitude of motherhood than to the stern abstractness of war and government. It fits its possessor, as no masculine quality can, for the lofty duties of nursing and training the men and women of the future. Who shall measure the influence of the home and motherhood upon character? What avails progress or education or wealth without character? There are men of our day who believe that woman has so nearly approached manhood that she may well undertake all the masculine duties of citizenship. I do not think woman has changed. I think man has become more womanish, and therefore sees no great difference in the qualities of the opposite sex. This is what has heretofore happened, and this is why the advent of woman in politics and government has always been the sign of decadence.

"Let us inquire of ourselves what will happen in a republic if general suffrage when three suffragettes and two men who see no great difference between men and women, constituting a group of five, in a time of popular excitement, seek to enforce their will against a group of three men of the ordinary type. The answer must be—they cannot do it. Well, you may multiply each group by one hundred thousand or by one million, and the answer will be the same. When the will of a majority of the voters is set at naught and disregarded that is the end of such a republic. This is what is meant when it is said that the majority of voters must represent the majority of physical power.

"Again, it has been thought heretofore, to be of supreme importance that family life should be united and harmonious and that the marriage tie be made as permanent and binding as possible. The increasing prevalence of divorce has been pointed out as a sign of decadence, as something which affected the morals of the future citizen and the stability of the State. But to confer the suffrage upon women is to throw an apple of discord between husband and wife. If the wife always agrees with and votes with her husband, the effect of the law is merely to give him two votes; if the husband always agrees with and votes with her, its effect is to give her two votes; in such cases the law is useless. If she is expected to exercise independent political judgment this will promote domestic discord and weaken family ties by the mere fact of disagreement and discussion. It would be bad if it stopped here; but in order to make her vote effective she must act with some organization, frequently supporting some other man against her husband.

"The majority of women do not want to vote. They are wiser than that. The greater number of the noisy minority demanding the ballot do not really believe in woman's great mission of motherhood and home-making. Their ideas of what constitutes distinction are perverted. They would like to be distinguished as publicists and statewomen. These women, consciously or subconsciously, regard man as the superior because nature had not laid so heavy a burden or imposed such grave or great duties upon him. They are deceived by superficial appearances and trifles. If they are to give up all notions of motherhood and take up the problems of law and government they will find some difficulties which they little suspect. The genius of woman is so ill adapted to affairs of government or war that the United States must become a byword among the nations when women interpose in its councils and its politics and are swayed by the tenderness, love, doubts and solicitude of the nursery. It is surely no good reason for extending the suffrage to women that so few want it, or that we have ignorant voters among the men, who are inferior in intelligence and probity to women.

"The woman who has no protector and who pays taxes is well provided for; she had no need for the ballot as a protector. Under existing laws women are highly favored. They are exempt from military service and jury service. If the husband owns real estate he cannot sell or dispose of it by will in such a way as to effect the wife's dower without her consent, Stats., secs. 2159, 2168, but she can sell or dispose of her real estate by will without his consent. Schmidt v. Raymond, 134 N. W. 362. In case of a divorce he must divide his property with her, but even if she is wealthy she cannot be compelled to provide alimony for him. Binger v. Binger, 142, Wis. 26. He is obliged to pay her bills even for false teeth, but she does not have to pay his bills, although able to do so. Clark v. Teneson, 148 Wis. 65. She may be worth a million and cut the husband off without a cent by her will or conveyance, but he cannot cut her off by either without her consent. If he dies leaving children, a widow and an estate, no matter how large, consisting of personal property, she not only gets her widow's allowance, but comes in equally with the children for a share of the personal estate, while under the same circumstances, no matter how wealthy she may be, he gets nothing. Stats., secs. 3938 and 2270. If the homestead is in his name he cannot sell or mortgage it without the signature of his wife; if it is in her name she may sell or mortgage it without his signature. Stats., sec. 2203 and notes. The same as to exempt personal property, sec. 2313.

"The husband can be arrested and prosecuted criminally if he fail to support his wife needing such support, but no matter how wealthy she is or how sick or poor he is, she is not so liable. Sec. 4587c and amendments. The personal property of the wife is assessed against the husband (stats., sec. 1044), and by the new Income Tax Law he must report and pay tax on the income of his wife. If she commits a crime while in his presence it is presumed that he coerced her to do so, and he will be presumed guilty and she not guilty. 15 Ency. 901 et seq. If she slanders her neighbor he must pay the damages, but if he slanders he must stand the consequences himself. Idem 984. This list does not exhaust the favors women now enjoy under the law."

The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE - - - New York
Secretary, MRS. MORGAN G. BULKELEY - Hartford, Conn.
Treasurer, MRS. ROBERT GARRETT - Roland Park, Baltimore

Vol. 1 JULY, 1912 No. 3

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

A WORD OF APPRECIATION.

WITH THIS, the third number of The Woman's Protest, we have every reason to be truly grateful for the kind reception our publication has received. Although but three months old, The Woman's Protest has a large and growing subscription list, an ever widening influence, the approval and commendation of the greater part of American womanhood—and a threatened libel suit for $200,000, for all of which we are indeed thankful. The suit, which our friends, the Suffragists, talk of bringing, is flattering as well as novel. They think our analysis of their parade libeled it. Our alibi, of course, is obvious.

EMOTION, NOT REASON, THE SUFFRAGE IDEA.

MRS. BLATCH, in one of the "great dailies" of New York, sets forth with frank assurance the use made in the "suffrage" propaganda of the artful modern methods of advertising. "Conviction is largely a matter of feeling," she says, "and leaders of any movement do well to study somewhat the methods of the press agent. The mere words 'Votes for women! Votes for women!' repeated over and over again, would at last carry the idea of the political freedom of women into many obtuse minds." A few days before, in an address, she said, "It is not reason and logic that convince, but an appeal to emotion."

The proposal to double the electorate by adding a new element frankly led by emotionalism may surely be considered a menace so grave as to give men not only food for thought, but cause for at least the emotion of indignation. There is occasion for both in that reckless appeal to passion.

It is a serious charge against the newspapers that they are chiefly responsible for the growth of the movement. Many have been much perplexed by the apparent indifference to their high responsibility shown by those who determine the policies of the great journals. The opportunity a journalist has to keep public opinion fairly steady and on the tracks of truth and reason is a great one. It is an infinite pity that it should ever be treated flippantly or indifferently or with an apparent desire to please, or avoid offending a particular class of supposed readers who may be pushing a noisy "cause."

Mrs. Blatch is right in her rough cynicism as to the thing that moves the public, at least as we get it in the suffragist meetings and the newspapers. The question is one of organic law, of fundamental principles, and so should be determined by those fitted by experience and training to deal with profound questions. It is not a matter of milk and wages. It is an assault upon the stability of both social and political life.

THEY FAIL TO MAKE GOOD.

A PRINCIPAL stock argument of the suffragists has been that they would produce, when they gained their rights, improved conditions everywhere. Experience in the States where suffrage obtains shows, if not the contrary, that there has been no beneficial results. Politics have not been purified nor in any way changed, nor has there been any diminution of bossism, or of any of the prevailing political or social evils.

ANOTHER PROBLEM FOR WOMEN VOTERS.

WHILE working for a woman suffrage plank in the Republican platform the suffrage leaders announced at Chicago that they would see that the women voters in the suffrage States would not vote for any man for President whose platform did not include a suffrage plank.

The suffragists failed in their efforts at Baltimore and Chicago. Will they disfranchise the women voters of the Suffrage States or will the suffragists vote the Socialistic ticket? They can always find solace there, as the Socialistic platform always includes a woman suffrage plank.

THE latest cable dispatches to the newspapers bring the information that the wives of the English Ministers are suffering from the petty persecution of the suffragettes. "The anonymous letters sent the wives of the Ministers are couched in abusive and threatening terms, and are often of the most shameful description," says the New York Sun of June 29th. The American suffragettes, however, are not behind their strenuous English sisters. Anonymous letters to the women who oppose suffrage are of almost daily occurrence, and are often unfit for publication.

Failure of Suffrage in Colorado; Why It Fails.

Student of Political Situation Tells How Woman's Vote in State is Not Only Not Beneficial But Actually Harmful.

[On account of the well known boycotting tactics of the suffragettes, the name of the gentleman of Colorado who contributes this paper, is not given. His conclusions are based on his personal observation of the working of equal suffrage, and are shared by a large number of thinking and intelligent men and women of Colorado. The statute books of Colorado will prove the absolute truth of his assertions in regard to the laws of that State.—Note.]

Woman suffrage in Colorado has proved itself a failure, not because it has not accomplished anything beneficial, perhaps, but because it has not accomplished as much as it should have accomplished. It has been a failure because it has not been an enthusiastic success.

It has been a failure because it has not resulted in placing on the statute books of this State laws that particularly or notably elevated the race or enhanced the conditions of living in Colorado. In other words, it does not appear to me that the institution of equal suffrage has been responsible for any good legislation that would not have been enacted without it, while at the same time it has not prevented the enactment of any vicious legislation that would not have been prevented without it. It has been a failure not so much because it has simply failed

as because it has not made good abundantly. It has not fulfilled the pledges made for it by its devotees.

It is true that during the seventeen years of its existence in this State a great deal of pressure has been brought to bear on town boards, city councils and State Legislatures by influential women, by able women and by good women—pressure and influence that all had the good of the community or the State at heart. For the improvement of the State institutions, and particularly for the educational institutions; for the Industrial Home for Boys and for the Industrial Home for Girls, the Asylum for the Insane, the Deaf and Blind School and for the creation and establishment of juvenile courts and their maintenance, the good women of the State have been especially active —and I am only afraid that their activity for these Homes and these courts has resulted in the neglect of the Homes to such an extent that the business of the courts and the patronage of the Homes increased accordingly.

The woman's lobby at Colorado Legislatures during the past ten years has always been a large one. It has always been composed of influential women, of able women and of good, though I believe, misguided women. They would kiss their children good-by in bed in the morning and rush off to the halls of legislation and remain all day for weeks at a time for what they thought was the uplift of the race, while the race itself, represented by their children at home, was being looked after in an indifferent way by proxy in the form of a nurse or hired girl, growing up to know no mother, no authority and no guide. And if their lobbying had any effect at all, which is rather doubtful, it cannot be shown that we have any better or different laws than we would live under had women suffrage never been instituted. Women, earnestly and sincerely working for the betterment of the race, could have achieved as much with the implements at hand—certainly could not have achieved less.

To my mind no vote of any people and no proclamation of any Governor can make the "fair sex" any more potent for good than they are as they come from the hands of their creator. Votes cannot make Florence Nightingales; the enfranchisement of women cannot give the world any more Grace Darlings, and until the suffragettes can offer something of this sort it is as stale and unprofitable as a Republican nomination in Texas or a place on the dry ticket in old Missouri.

The question of equal suffrage in Colorado was submitted to the electors of the State by constitutional amendment, November 7, 1893, and of the votes cast, 35,798 votes were cast for equal suffrage, and 29,451 votes were cast against it.

The majority for equal suffrage was approximately 6,000 out of 65,000 votes cast on the proposition, but this furnishes no criterion for anything, as those voting on the amendment were casting their ballots altogether on theory and such belief as they could gather from Moses and the prophets—the experience of those gone before. At that time but one other State, Wyoming, has absolute equal suffrage and the population and electorate of Wyoming were so small that the experience of that State did not furnish anything to base judgment on or furnish direction that was satisfactory either way.

It appears that every few years our political and industrial system acquires a case of jim-jams. Colorado had it in its most virulent form at the time equal suffrage was adopted. Colorado was on one of its political jags; it was maudlin, and the wonder is, not that equal suffrage carried, but that it had such a small majority.

When its advocates were engaged in the agitation that resulted in the enactment of the law providing for the submission of the amendment to the people, and during the campaign that followed between the adjournment of the Legislature and the day of election, their claims were as generous and as far-reaching as a wrapper around a box of Pale Pills for Pink People. Equal suffrage was the long-sought and elusive panacea for all political pains, the catholicon for all of Colorado's conniption fits. When suffrage was extended to women the ills of the State would disappear. The very sage brush would grow baked apples and whipped cream; the social evil would be wiped out; the evils of intemperance would become ancient history; silver would be rehabilitated and the free coinage of adobe mud at a ratio not greater than sixteen to one would become an establishment; tears would be wiped from every eye, the sun would shine every day and the moon report for duty every night. We were told that when the ballot-box was given the benefit of woman's finer intellect and higher morals, Colorado, impoverished and broken in spirit, would be rescued from the abject slavery that threatened it, and its feet placed upon the solid rock of prosperity, peace, happiness and contentment, so that this centennial State would remind one of nothing so much as a drunken bumble bee in a field of ripe alfalfa.

Despite the optimistic ravings of the benefits that would follow the ballot in woman's hands, history teaches us that it has failed positively in that no meritorious legislation can be directly traced to its influence or its work. It has failed negatively in that it has detracted from woman's power and influence in that more important place in our political, industrial and social world—more important than the halls of legislation, the home, the grandest spot on earth to every human being worth the name, the one place that transcends the school, the church and legislative halls as a place for the forming, developing and finishing of character, with our women doing their duty, their whole duty, and nothing but their duty in the home—without of course neglecting the interest in the school and the work of the church, which are auxiliary to the home, for the same length of time that equal suffrage has prevailed in Colorado, would, to my mind, have brought forth abundantly better results than a century of legislation for which women may be responsible.

Now do not understand that I have any sympathy with the prejudiced and dogmatic party, who discusses equal suffrage and disposes of it with a wave of the hand and the bluff and gruff "A woman's place is the home." It might just as properly be said that a man's place is at work.

The kernel of the proposition from my viewpoint is that woman in politics has not achieved anything, while I greatly fear that politics in women has and will hurt the sex and consequently the race.

Let us look at a few instances that are specific and capable of proof or otherwise, and let them mirror the whole situation. We know that Colorado, generally, has no better laws than any other State, notwithstanding that it did not get Statehood until 1876, and was heir of all the ages. We do know that it is behind many States in wise and beneficent legislation. We know that it is away behind Illinois and Massachusetts in legislation which is supposed to appeal especially to mothers and wives. Our child labor laws are behind other States without equal suffrage, and it has been charged, with some truth, that bills introduced in our Legislatures with the purpose of improving conditions surrounding children, particularly the unfortunate and dependent, have failed of passage or have died in committee or at the desk of the docket clerk because fathered—or probably "mothered" would be a better word here—by lady members of the Legislature, who, as such, have never been taken seriously by their sixty or ninety male companions.

There is no law on the statute books of this State making it a misdemeanor to keep women employed more than a certain number of hours each day or week, but in a great many States where women do not vote such laws have been enacted and are enforced—and in Colorado there is an eight-hour-per-day law for *men* employed in mines and other underground workings, and a law restricting the number of consecutive hours a railroad employee may work. And so on through the list of legislative acts that might be expected to grace our statute books where women wield the ballot and where such legislation was promised.

The social evil has not disappeared, but has grown at an

alarming rate. Juvenile crime and delinquency have increased and flourished until the very moral life of the State is threatened. Both of the foregoing evils have laid their foul presence on the very high schools in the largest city of this State to such a notorious extent that recently drastic measures were considered for a cleaning up, and some considerable number of pupils have been taken from these institutions by their parents because of these revelations and have been placed in other places of learning or their schooling discontinued.

Divorces have doubled in the past fifteen years. Possibly woman suffrage has had nothing to do with these conditions; it may be only a coincidence. But whether connected or merely a coincidence it is one of the points I make against woman suffrage as a success. Had it been the success that its advocates and champions promised and as we had some reason to expect, these conditions would not only not have thrived, but would have been fought and whipped and wiped out. *We know there is much that is wrong in these peculiar symptoms of moral leprosy, and if equal suffrage is not responsible for many of these ills, it had done nothing to cure them. We learn from this deplorable condition that it is no political palladium or social deity. It is an idol whose impuissance for good has been amply proven, its capacity for evil strongly suspected.*

As an institution it has been a failure for the reason that it has attracted women who would have been good mothers and excellent wives into the fascinating whirl of politics and political clubdom. Women's clubs by the score exist at this time that did not exist and did not have excuse for existence until the crime of 1893. These clubs were called or excused into being to propagate and promote the legislation that has already been referred to as particularly sympathetic with women's natural desires and natural work, but from the fact that the legislation has not been enacted it is not unfair to assume that the clubs have been a failure in their alleged objects and the homes of the members been robbed of much of the proper influence and atmosphere. This neglect, to my mind, cannot fail to have hurt the homes, weakened the work and lessened the love that should abide in them for the uplift of the race. This deduction, perhaps, I could not substantiate, but the champions of woman suffrage cannot disprove it, and in support of it and as a foundation for such a conclusion we have the records of the juvenile courts and the industrial homes for boys and girls, and of the State Reformatory, where an astounding increase in juvenile crime and delinquency are recorded. We have the records of the divorce courts and, while the population of Colorado has not nearly doubled during the past fifteen years the number of divorces has. The divorce record, I believe, is at least distantly related to equal suffrage, *while the increase in juvenile perverts certainly reflect neglected homes.*

One of the arguments that was made much of by those agitating equal suffrage during the campaign for it, was that wives and mothers *would influence and generally control the votes of husband and sons. We know, after sixteen years' experience, that this is not the case; we know the husbands generally control.* Not, except in rare instances, by harsh, extreme or disagreeable measures or means, but because the *wives defer* to the judgment and the desires, to the dislikes, prejudices and *even the bigotry of their husbands.*

Recently in the city of Denver was held an election for city officers, upon the question of granting a valuable water franchise, for several amendments to the city charter and for the submission of what is popularly known as local option, the creation of anti-saloon territory by precinct, ward, city or county. While I do not admit that being for local option entitled one to wear the badge of goodness, morality or godliness any more than being against local option does, it is generally considered and conceded that women will be found on the side of anything that masquerades under the name of temperance—temperance being devoutly wished by all good people. Although at that election thousands of women registered who could not be induced to register at previous elections and who could not be induced to register at the following election—the one held November 8, 1911—a distinct defeat for the cause of woman suffrage. And local option was defeated by almost two to one. At the election referred to the company asking the water franchise had headquarters at one of the large hotels in Denver. Money at these headquarters flowed like water, and it has been said by one well experienced in matters of this kind that at least a quarter of a million dollars was spent. The money ostensibly went for "workers," but to those familiar with the management of the campaign it is known that a large part of it went for bribes. Women jostled with men to get at the political lunch counter, and the franchise was defeated by a large majority. This, I also regard as a sensible vote, but the conduct of hundreds of women on that occasion does not tend to make one get up on his hind legs and shout himself hoarse for the cause of woman suffrage.

We expect better things from women. Having found them or placed them on a pedestal higher than ourselves we are entitled to more from them. It shames good women and it shames the most brazen as well as the best men to see women act thus, and we must all feel that, inasmuch as positive benefits have not accrued from her possession of the ballot, this opportunity to debauch womanhood should be removed.

I regard woman suffrage as a failure, first, because it has not improved our politics or raised the standard of legislation or of living in any walk of life; second, it has alienated many good women from the work of the home and the pleasures and responsibilities of wives and mothers. But it should not have been expected that giving the franchise to women would have wiped out so much evil and promoted so much good as its seconds promised. No act and no number of acts of legislation will march in the millennium and few can bring even temporary happiness or improve even the conditions of the race. This country seems to have gone crazy on the subject of reform legislation. There is no lack of remedies. The political drug store is full of panaceas, each with the trade mark of some wild-eyed reformer blown in the bottle. Equal or woman suffrage is one of them.

There is only one foundation on which we can safely build, only one law that guarantees and insures to any country, any nation and any State, happiness and supremacy. Laws cannot make a people virtuous or happy; laws cannot prevent the growth of sin and evil in children; laws cannot prevent mistakes in marriage; and laws cannot guard the sanctity of the home. Though Moses draft the constitution of a country and Solomon make its laws, misery and sin and crime and poverty will exist in a greater or less degree. There has only been one rule ever given to men that will bring peace and happiness and prosperity and exaltation to any country, and any commonwealth and any people, and that is, "As ye would that others should do unto you, do ye so to them." That rule is applicable and workable in the hovel or the castle; in the street and in the market-place; in the office and in the workshop and the store. It will work in Colorado and it will work in New York; it will work in America and it will work in the Fiji Islands. Whether civilized or savage, Christian or pagan, Presbyterian or Populist, Democrat or Republican, this rule will do everything that has ever been promised by all the legislation from Solomon's day to date. Followed faithfully by a band of earnest, sincere men and women, it will revolutionize this community within a decade and usher in the millennium within a century.

I am convinced that in States where women have not equal suffrage they do not want it, and in Colorado at least of the States suffering from it, if left to women themselves, that section of the constitution giving it to them would be so amended as to nullify or repeal it.

I have yet to see a woman with a kindly, sympathetic face and a low, sweet voice that thrills the hearts of men, clamoring for female enfranchisement. The woman who can with a glance or a word bring man to her feet; who can transform a hum-

ble cottage into a happy home gilded with God's own glory; who can make a husband play the lover through a long life-time—such women never suspect the world will go to Hades if they do not hustle to the polls and deposit in the urn of political destiny ballots decorated with their political preferences. They know that every law that does them wrong is written on the sand; that every Government that fails to guard them as its chief glory is doomed to nameless death. Served by the world's wisdom and circled by its chivalry, they stand secure—Empresses by Right Divine. In Colorado the home-woman ofttimes goes to the polls as well as her "progressive" sister, but she does so because those she loves are pulling for the success of party and have called upon her to offset the female vote of the opposition. The true woman, the woman who is really a helpmeet to man, the woman who is "first at the cradle and last at the grave"; the woman who laughs at us but loves us—such women do not have to wring concessions by the ballot from those who live only to serve them.

Political Equality Not a Cure for Evil Social Conditions.

Frances Beatty Gives Reasons Why She is Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

BY FRANCES BEATTY.

The demand for suffrage for women no doubt has a basis in the feeling of democracy that there is no reason why women should not have every right and privilege that is given to men. Every person who believes in democracy is anxious to see more opportunity given to the weaker classes of society, and there is no doubt that women are in this class. It does not follow, however, that because it is desirable to give more liberty and more opportunity to the weaker, that women should have the ballot.

Women in most countries have been exempted from the responsibilities of the ballot—not denied the right to vote. No doubt there are many women who could vote intelligently upon political questions, but the experience, training and calling of the great mass of women has not been such as to qualify them for the suffrage. All arguments that women have a right to vote are aside from the question. The whole question is simply one of governmental expediency, whether it is wise that women should vote.

It is true that our industrial institutions and our industrial life have drawn women more and more into the factories and mills, but it is equally true that this is inconsistent with the natural sphere of women and the welfare of the human race.

It is idle to say that she should be still further weaned away by means of the ballot, because economic conditions have already placed her in factories and mills. It would be far wiser to say that the economic conditions should change so that a woman need not abandon her position as a mother of children for the sake of working in factories and mills.

If all women were to follow those occupations, the human race would die, and the wise sociologist, rather than find out more ways in which women can be used, should seek to change the laws and conditions of life so as to save women from entering the fields that have long been the special function of men.

Women for many years have tried various vocations which have generally been followed by men. They have been doctors and lawyers, and yet almost no woman has ever achieved any kind of reputation in either line. It is not that women have been denied a chance to these callings, but the fact is that for several generations they have had access to these callings and never have and probably never can achieve any great distinction in either line.

No one who stops to think can believe it possible that woman could add to the wisdom of government. Men are sufficiently ignorant; but most men, during a large portion of their lives, give a great deal of attention to political and public matters—women give almost none.

That these women, ill equipped and without previous training, can be qualified to exercise the powers of statesmanship is absurd.

It is meant indiscriminately to give them the right to vote, without any sort of preparation, against all the instincts and intuitions of their lives, upon matters which are entirely strange to them, without any period of probation, which is absolutely necessary to any calling in life. To say that it would not seriously affect political and industrial institutions is madness. If it has any effect it will be serious, and if it has no effect, it will be useless. To say that it will not affect women injuriously is to say that women, without any training, against all their intuitions and against all their experiences, are as well qualified to vote as men. This cannot be true unless intuition counts for more than experience and knowledge, unless sentiment is stronger than reason. It cannot be true if experience of business and of life count for anything in any branch of human activity. It would be just as wise to say that the women of this country were to-day as well qualified to run a railroad, or any other business institution, as to say that they are as well qualified to vote as are men who, after long years of practise and experience, perform this task poorly indeed.

When women, in any great numbers, show any desire to familiarize themselves with political questions; when they show themselves qualified to compete with men in matters which concern government; when they write books on political economy and government of States and constitutional law; when they become distinguished at the bar and in medicine; when they show that philosophy which makes them distinguish between cause and effect; when, in short, they are qualified for citizenship, even as poorly as man, then it will be another question, but that this should come in a moment by an act of the Legislature or a popular vote, contrary to all the past, in spite of all the past and all the present, and that it can be given without serious result to the State and the individual, is impossible.

The fact that only a small percentage of women demand it is an important fact in this relation. It shows they do not care for politics and are not interested in it. Even though a few may be better qualified than man, the Legislature can find some way to provide for those few, in appointive positions. They must consider the many with the few, and these women, however brilliant, should exercise their powers in some way other than by the use of the ballot.

When this question is considered purely as for the good of the State, and stripped of the idea that there is a sacred right to vote, there is little chance for any person to misunderstand.

The government of States and cities ought to be as important as that of railroads and canals and factories. The problem is even more intricate because it involves a knowledge of history, of philosophy and the experience of life, and unless one could believe that women are as well fitted to manage railroads and steamships and telegraph companies as men, then by what logic can it be said that they are fitted to manage the affairs of government of States and cities?

If men have proved such poor law-makers as the suffragists assert, the mothers of the nation should prove that they can train their sons better before demanding the responsibility of the ballot.—Mary K. Sedgwick.

SUFFRAGE HYSTERIA TAKES LETTER-WRITING FORM.

A representative of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, while in Oregon recently, received the following anonymous letter. The letter was read at the anti-suffrage meetings throughout the State as evidence of the hysteria of the suffrage movement. The writer of the letter evidently needs a physician more than she needs the ballot:

Portland, Ore., May 4, 1912.

I will drop you a line to say that we all pity and sympathize with you. You are certainly doing what few women would stoop to, but we are not blaming you for it. You need the money, and must make a living in some way. I hope you are getting more pay than you would doing other things that you might, in time, have been fitted for, such as scrubbing floors, washing and ironing, taking care of children, and who knows but in time you might have even become capable of clerking in a department store, or being a stenographer. Of course this would take longer preparation and more brains.

We all wondered what your object could be in taking up arms against your own sex. And not until we learned that you were in the pay of the whisky interests did we know. You are getting money in just the way Judas got thirty pieces of silver when he betrayed his Master. If you could only think of the sin and suffering, the crime and misery—how could you take their money? It may make you happy here; but life is so short and we are all hastening on to the great beyond. We brought nothing into this world. We will take nothing out. I would far rather do the scrubbing.

I did not always believe in "votes for women," but I was too young, and did not take the time to think. I do thank God I never did anything to oppose it. I was only indifferent. I knew even if it became a law I would not be obliged to vote. No one would make me; but as I studied the matter I found it a subject with but one side—the world's great progress side—God's side. All my feeble efforts, had I been inclined to put them forward against this great onward movement, would have availed nothing. And how thankful I feel that I did not try to lift a finger against God's great plan! Then I looked at the class of people who opposed it. Who are they? What do they stand for, aside from money? Some of the husbands rent their property for saloons and dives, headquarters for the "white slave traffic," while the wives give "pink teas" to keep up rescue homes for the poor girls who become fallen. Alas! "consistency, thou art a jewel."

There is, indeed, no fool like the lady-like fool. These idle rich tell us "The place for women is in the home," and yet you meet them at all the bridge parties; in fact, that is all they have to do aside from petting the poodle dog; there is not one thinking woman among them; not a club woman, not a lodge woman, and, let us hope, not a church woman, unless it be in name only.

Wishing you all you are able to get out of it, for you are surely earning every cent they pay you. As I said before, you are doing what few women would undertake—even those more ignorant and shallow-brained than yourself, if that were possible.

Yours sincerely,
An Old-fashioned Mother.

A WIND-MILL BOYCOTT.

While the great majority of American women who desire the ballot for their sex are working along dignified lines, there is a faction or a percentage which never misses an opportunity to do something that will bring the movement into ridicule and disrepute. The latest antic of the extremists is to organize a boycott of everything made in England, on the sole ground that England is "persecuting" the dear sisters across the water by locking them up for destroying property and generally making nuisances of themselves.

There are circumstances under which it is highly inadvisable to buy articles made in England or any other foreign country, if the same articles equally good and cheap can be secured in America. On the other hand, there are conditions under which it might be wholly excusable to do so, though on general principles the fewer commodities purchased abroad the better for the trade situation in this country. But the boycott based on the "persecution" of the English suffragettes is so absurd that it reflects seriously on the fitness for the ballot of those who have organized the campaign.

The English suffragettes have been treated with amazing leniency, in view of the unmitigated and very destructive nuisances they have made of themselves. Men who commit offenses a tenth part as aggravated and inexcusable are punished with much greater severity. It has become a serious problem as to whether the mildness with which the English suffragettes have been treated has not poured fuel on the flames of "militant suffragism," and this view seems to be taken by the judges who in the most recent cases have made the punishment more drastic.

To threaten to boycott English products because English courts deal out justice to English offenders is the height of nonsense. The "Sons of Liberty," after whom this latest crusade takes its name, boycotted English goods because Americans were persecuted in reality. The English sense of humor is not nearly so dull as the jokesmiths are wont to make it appear, but if it were even blunter than that it could not fail to see the clumsy irony of American women boycotting English goods because window-smashers 3,000 miles away are sent to jail, where they belong.

American women have shown their patriotism on many occasions by assisting in building up the home market. If they wish to encourage home products there is plenty of opportunity for doing so. But it ought to be done under less laughable auspices than the ludicrous spectacle presented by the New York suffragists and their "windmill" boycott.—Kansas City Journal, June 4, 1912.

APOLOGY FOR INSULT TO ANTI-SUFFRAGIST.

A woman representing the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was invited recently to address the Portland (Ore.), Prohibition League. During her address she was interrupted by persons in the audience who demanded to know with what Church, if any, she was affiliated. When she replied that she was a Catholic certain persons in the audience became so offensive and insulting that the speaker left the platform and the hall. With her went the major portion of the audience. Since then she has received the following letter:

"Dear Madam:

"The following is the resolution adopted by the Portland Prohibition League at its meeting on Monday evening, May 6, 1912, and which I take pleasure in sending you:

"RESOLVED, that this organization send a hearty vote of thanks to the speaker of the evening for her kindness in addressing us; and be it further

"RESOLVED, that the fact that she belongs to a certain Church created no disfavor in the minds of the audience regarding her work.

"Very truly yours,

"Portland Prohibition League, per V. G. Hinshaw, president."

ANOTHER SAMPLE OF SUFFRAGE CARTOON LOGIC

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE QUARTETTE

The repertoire of this admirable combination includes all the familiar sophistical melodies: "Protect the Home," "Sweet Woman's Sphere's the Home," "Keep Your Dear Mother Out of Politics," "Oh, Leave Things As They Be," "Let the Woman Mind the Baby," "Let 'Em Use Their Influence," etc., etc., etc.—*The Woman's Journal, Saturday, March 23, 1911.*

[Although the suffragists constantly accuse the women who are opposed to the movement of having an alliance with the liquor interests, the anti-suffragists have at no time solicited the co-operation of the liquor interests, as have the suffragists upon more than one occasion. We reprint the letter of Susan B. Anthony, appealing to the brewers for their support of the suffrage cause, the letter being taken from the report of the Fortieth Convention of the U. S. Brewers' Association.]

LETTER OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY ASKING INFLUENCE OF BREWERS FOR THE VOTE.

ROCHESTER, May 23, 1900.

To the President, Officers and Members of the United States Brewers' Ass'n, in Session at Atlantic City, N. J., June 5-7.

Gentlemen: As chairman of the committee appointed by our National Suffrage Association to address letters to all of the large conventions held this year, allow me to bring before you the great need of the recognition of the women of our country in all of the rights, privileges and immunities of United States citizenship.

Though your association has for its principal object the management of the great brewing interests of this country, yet I have noted that from year to year you have adopted resolutions declaring against woman's suffrage. I therefore appeal to you, since the question seems to come within the scope of your deliberations, that you will reverse your action, this closing year of the century, and declare yourselves in favor of the practical application of the fundamental principles of our government to all the people—women as well as men. Whatever your nationality, whatever your religious creed, whatever your political party, you are either a born or naturalized citizen of the United States, and because of that are a voter of the State in which you reside. Will you not, gentlemen, accord to the women of this country, having the same citizenship as yourselves, precisely the same privileges and powers which you possess because of that one fact? The only true principle—the only safe policy—of a democratic-republican government is that every class of people shall be protected in the exercise of the right of individual representation. I pray you, therefore, to pass a resolution in favor of woman suffrage, and order your officers, in behalf of the association, to sign a petition to Congress for this purpose, and thereby put the weight of your influence on the side of making this government a genuine republic.

Enclosed is a form of petition to Congress for a Sixteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, which shall prohibit the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex. Please make two copies of it on your own official paper, if adopted, and return both to me after they are signed. Kindly send me also a copy of the woman's suffrage resolution if one is passed. In any case, I shall esteem it a favor to be informed of whatever action may be taken upon these requests.

Should you desire to have one of our best woman's suffrage speakers to address your convention, if you will let me know as soon as possible, I will take pleasure in arranging for one to do so. Hoping to hear from you favorably, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

Mr. Obermann: Miss Susan B. Anthony is entitled to the respect of every man and woman in this country, whether we agree with her theories or not. I think it but fair and courteous to Miss Anthony that the secretary be instructed to answer that letter and to inform Miss Anthony that this is a body of business men; that we meet for business purposes and not for politics; furthermore, that she is mistaken and misinformed regarding her statement that we have passed resolutions opposing woman's suffrage. We have never taken such action at any of our conventions or on any other occasion. I submit this as a motion. (Carried.)

no attraction. The tea-jacket implies tea and the vote implies many masculine obligations which women neither care for, nor are fitted to endure. Jeanne d'Arc came forth to save her country with her spiritual force—not to tear it to pieces by faction in a wild grasp at place and power. Miss Tarbell moreover, has learned that lesson which so few modern women seem able to grasp—to "find their strength in limitations." It is a lesson which great women and men, like George Washington or Saint Theresa, have readily accepted. It means a deepening at the roots. The suffrage movement, like all shallow things, is distinguished by its formlessness and lack of limitation.

J. W.

MRS. LAIDLAW'S IDEA OF A WOMAN'S BUSINESS.

In the New York Times of May 26 Mrs. Harriet Burton Laidlaw writes as follows:

"There has been a recent article in one of our magazines, called 'The Business of Being a Woman.' I defy you, in the respectable literature of the last 200 years, to find a more degenerate and shameful phrase than 'the business of being a woman.' There are just two cases, salient cases, of the business of being a woman, and that is, the Oriental harem, where a woman is imprisoned for one purpose, cut off from the life of her country, and the tolerated house of prostitution in our great cities and throughout our great country, where the white slave is imprisoned for one purpose and cut off, not only from the life but from all the justice and hope of her country. Now, I submit to you that that is the business of being a woman, and I will submit to you also, as a phenomenon of our modern life, that it is a hard choice to give millions of our women—the choice of being a woman in that sense and being industrial slaves."

MRS. SCOTT REPLIES TO MRS. LAIDLAW.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

The irritating source of the woman suffrage movement is again laid bare in Mrs. Laidlaw's letter to "The Times" of to-day. We must seek for some justification of the contentious spirit which many men and women are showing at present, in such pitiful misconceptions, such childlike misunderstandings, of the relations of things, as Mrs. Laidlaw's letter discloses.

That a high-minded woman should so misconstrue Miss Tarbell's fine discussion of the obligations of motherhood shocks and frightens the thoughtful observer of passing events. Miss Tarbell says that "Nature's reason for the woman is the bearing and rearing of the child." She calls this the "business of being a woman." Mrs. Laidlaw says, "I defy you . . . to find a more degenerate and shameful phrase than the 'business of being a woman,'" and then she proceeds to her own painfully mistaken interpretation of the phrase, which stands for the complex occupations of motherhood—which is, without any question, the highest business of woman, if she herself does not degrade it.

The normal woman is daughter, wife and mother. The agitators will persist in discussing the exceptional woman and her occupations and needs, while they relegate to a secondary importance the normal type. But it is upon the normal type that all discussion must centre; and the great question is how to decrease the number of exceptions.

The woman who has not carried a child close to her heart, guarding her thoughts and acts in loving care of the new life which she creates for the world's use, and for which she is opening the gates of human experience, has never known the true, high "business of being a woman." When through years of care, a mother guards and trains her child, she is incessantly occupied with those concerns which are the "business of the woman." She must not only fit the child, so far as in her lies, for the struggle in this life, but molds a character which may fit it for higher ranges of effort in other lives, if such there be. Her labors are by no means confined to the limits of her home, for in this care of the child she is led into most complex relations with the outside world—if she is attending to her business as a woman.

The demands of duty upon her are already often too great for her time and strength, and she has not yet developed sufficient understanding to meet fully the great occasion for woman's work.

Many of the evils which women would hope to cure by a vote can only be cured by enlarging woman's vision of her duties and powers. When we understand better the "business of being a woman" the Probation Officer and the Juvenile Court and other makeshifts for mothers will be less needed.

If law has any power to awaken conscience, let us by all means have a law making parents legally responsible for the good behavior of their minor children, that the seriousness of the "business of being a woman" may be brought shrewdly home to those who fail to understand it.

Mrs. Wm. Forse Scott,
Chairman Publications Committee New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.
New York, May 27, 1912.

The articles by Ida Tarbell that have appeared in the "American Magazine" on the woman question are attracting a great deal of attention from the suffragists as well as from those who do not believe that the vote is necessary for the best development of woman.

Although the articles only mention suffrage two or three times, they are aimed apparently to show that something is wrong with the present condition of women and to suggest remedies. They go into fundamentals and are interesting even to those who do not agree with them.

They were considered sufficiently important for four prominent suffragists to devote the evening of April 15th to answering the first four, which had the titles "The Uneasy Woman," "Making a Man of Herself," "The Business of Being a Woman" and "The Homeless Daughter." Two more under the titles "The Irresponsible Woman and the Friendless Child," and "The Woman of Democracy" were in the May and June numbers of the "American Magazine." The whole series will be issued later in book form.

Both Conventions Ignore Woman Suffrage Question.

Neither of the Big Political Parties is Prepared to Accept "Votes for Women" as a National Question.

Before the delegates had assembled for the Republican and Democratic Conventions the suffrage trumpets were blowing loudly for a suffrage plank. In Chicago the suffragists were to have a "mammoth parade" in order to impress their importance upon the members of the Republican Convention. At the eleventh hour, however, the parade was abandoned, and the lobbyists put in their time talking suffrage to such of the delegates as could be caught on the run.

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, with representatives from several of the State organizations, watched the movements of the suffragists in Chicago, but, acting upon the best possible political advice, made no attempt to secure a hearing. The women opposed to suffrage were ready, however, to resist the demands of the suffragists, should occasion require, but at no time was there any danger of a suffrage plank being inserted in the Republican platform. The suffragists made the usual noise, with the usual result.

From Chicago Mrs. Dodge and the other representatives of the opposition movement went to Baltimore to watch the plank of the Democrats. The women of the Baltimore organization were fully prepared for any emergency, but before the Platform Committee had drafted the platform the suffragists abandoned their efforts, and thus endeth suffrage as a National issue.

The play of the suffragists would indicate that they had but little conception of State's rights, or of the functions of a political convention.

HOW MR. COFFEY QUIETS MT. VERNON SUFFRAGISTS.

Women of Assemblyman's City Overwhelmingly Endorse his Vote Against Suffrage Measure.

Assemblyman William S. Coffey, of Mt. Vernon, who voted against the suffrage measure at Albany, was attacked by suffragettes of his city, who alleged that he did not properly represent his constituency. To quiet the ladies and also to satisfy himself he held a special election in Mt. Vernon. He hired a hall, printed ballots and invited the women of his city to vote on the suffrage issue.

The result of the election clearly indicated to Mr. Coffey that he made no mistake. There were 360 votes cast, of which 130 were for suffrage and 230 against it—almost 2 to 1. It was not the overwhelming majority that pleased Mr. Coffey so much as the quality of the opposition. The brightest and cleverest women of Mt. Vernon endorsed Mr. Coffey's action.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Constitutional Convention Rejects Appeal of Suffragists by a Large Majority.

The long campaign waged between the New Hampshire Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage and the Equal Suffrage Societies, over the proposal to strike out the word "male" from the State Constitution, and allow women to vote, was brought to an end June 20, when the Constitutional Convention of New Hampshire voted upon the measure, the women opposed to the movement winning a decided victory.

The matter was debated for nearly two hours, the convention finally casting its vote against suffrage, the vote being 208 to 149. One of the members of the convention, Mr. Hill, of Concord, said the constitution of the State should not be thrown upon the scrap heap by ballasting it with woman suffrage, and another member, Mr. Martin, also of Concord, said that while he voted for suffrage ten years ago, he had since changed his opinion, convinced that a majority of the women of New Hampshire do not want to vote. Mr. Mitchell, another member, declared that women should be allowed to say for themselves whether they wanted the ballot or not, and with the women of New Hampshire formed into various organizations, protesting against the suffrage amendment, he would not vote for it.

The loss of New Hampshire was a great blow to the suffragists. In the West, they had already been boasting of the winning of New Hampshire, some of them so ill-informed on matters of procedure as to state publicly that when the measure was passed by the constitutional convention, it did not have to be ratified by the people, but that the women could vote at the November elections!

The women of New Hampshire who are opposed to suffrage worked heroically during the campaign, and women from Massachusetts materially aided their neighboring sisters in the defeat of the amendment. The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage sent its literature into the State, and the "stumping tout" of the Rev Anna Shaw and the suffrage leaders went for naught!

"IMPROVING" AN OLD SONG.

(A Suffragist's Idea.)

The following parody on a patriotic song was written by Miss Jennie R. Smith, a leading suffragist of Salem, Ore., as a tribute and a welcome to the Industrial Workers of the World:

THE I. W. W.

(By Jennie R. Smith, Salem, Ore.)

Tramp, tramp, tramp, the men are marching,
The Industrial Workers of the World;
They have come to Salem now
With the sweat upon their brow
To work in Salem's busy whirl.

Tramp, tramp, tramp, the men are marching;
They are marching to the right,
They will never say they're beat
Long as they can have the street
To carry on the free speech fight.

Tramp, tramp, tramp, the men are marching,
So join in the marching to-day;
Go to the fight with those that are right,
And carry the fight on the way.

—Salem Capital Journal.

NO VOTES FOR WOMEN, BECAUSE—

Suffrage is not a matter of right but of State expediency.

Only a noisy minority want the ballot.

It would introduce into politics women's candidacy, with sex questions and sex aspersions.

The "idea" has already made women aggressive, violent and abusive in public and affected the manner of many women.

"BOIL THEM UP!" SAYS MAUD MALONE, MILITANT SUFFRAGETTE.

To the Editor of the Sun:

Sir—It is not clear for which condidate Republican women voted at the California primaries, but probably they went for Roosevelt. By so doing they missed a fine chance to make good in the suffrage fight and to help the women of the other States.

Between the two leading candidates in the Republican party suffragettes have no choice. Both are not for us. Mr. Taft's attitude is shown in his Toledo speech, when he said: "Woman suffrage is doubtless coming as soon as the electorate can be certain most women desire it." A most decided straddle. At Akron, May 14th, he refused to answer when publicly asked by a suffragette about votes for women.

Mr. Roosevelt's attitude is well known. At a recent meeting in this city when asked about votes for women he had the suffragette threatened with arrest and thrown out. In California, according to Mrs. Gerberding, a suffragist of that State, Roosevelt told the women: "I believe in woman suffrage, but I am only lukewarm, as my wife is." Another political Adam! I would suggest to suffragettes that they treat politicians as they do water. When they are lukewarm put them on the fire and boil them up!

As far as the suffrage issue is concerned, the situation in the Republican party is: Taft and Roosevelt are out of the running. La Follette is the only one who is an open suffragist. What the convention brings forth we will see.

I appeal to suffragists, especially voters, not to support anti-suffragists. We are too powerful since we have adopted militant methods to support any man who will not support us. Make suffrage the issue. Do not advise women to defeat Taft, for by doing so we support Roosevelt. This is the political outcome of such advice, whatever our intention. The true suffragette should say, "Defeat them both. Give us a candidate who is for us." Then, giving up all other political issues, suffragists should vote for that man. Maud Malone.

New York, May 18th.

AN EQUATION.

The following interesting political equation, stated by a California woman, seems to put in a clear and succinct manner the whole woman question. Can any reader improve upon it?

If equal rights + privileges — the vote = equal rights + duties + the vote, then the vote = the duties of men — the privileges of women. Why waste time trying to pluck political lemons?

SUFFRAGISTS FLOCK WITH NOTORIOUS CHARACTERS.

Not Particular About Company They Keep if it Furthers Cause of "Votes for Women."

Mrs. Sarah Platt Decker, a leader of the suffragists in Colorado, and "Danny" Sullivan, a notorious political character, joined forces at a citizens' rally in Denver recently. Of this incident the Denver Times says editorially:

"Mrs. Sarah Platt Decker and Danny Sullivan on the same platform—that was one of the unforgetable features of the citizens' rally at the auditorium last evening.

"The pity of it can hardly be expressed. Thousands of self-respecting, home-loving people bore away with them last evening the sad vision of the leader of Colorado's best womanhood indorsing for public office a man twice arrested for bribery and a libertine, whose very name reeks of offenses against the purity of women."

WOMEN MAKE PROTEST TO POLITICAL PARTIES.

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage sent the following protest to both the Democratic and Republican Conventions last month:

To the honorable, the Committee on Platform and Resolutions of the Republican National Convention assembled in Chicago, June, 1912:

The women of the United States who are opposed to the extension of the suffrage to their sex desire to present their vigorous protest against the inclusion of a so-called woman suffrage plank in the platform of the National Republican Party.

BECAUSE

The petition is not made by the majority of women, but by a small minority, less than one-tenth of the women of the United States over voting age.

BECAUSE

We do not consider that if women were to enter the field of politics their participation in political life would be conducive to the well-being of the sex or the community at large.

BECAUSE

Industrial work done by men and women is done by women at too great an expenditure of vitality to make it wise to lay upon them the burden of compulsory public duties.

BECAUSE

The child-bearing half of the community should not be asked to assume additional burdens.

BECAUSE

We believe that women would not vote more intelligently or more conscientiously than men. By doubling the present unintelligent and indifferent vote the present problems before the people would be rendered more difficult without any apparent compensation.

BECAUSE

Legislation for women and children in the so-called "suffrage States" does not compare favorably with that in States in which there is manhood suffrage alone.

BECAUSE

A general or extensive participation of women in political life must, in time, seriously modify the social unit of the family as it now exists.

BECAUSE

We think that the argument that suffrage should be extended to women as an act of justice is a fallacy, which has led many broad-minded and intelligent minds from the paths of common sense.

We ask that the wishes of the acknowledged majority of women in the United States who are opposed to the extension of the suffrage to their sex be now respected, and that all mention of the extension of the suffrage to women be omitted from your platform—Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association; Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, president of the Connecticut association; Mrs. C. F. Corbin, president of the Illinois association; Mrs. Robert Garrett, president of the Maryland association; Miss Mary S. Ames, Massachusetts; Mrs. Edson J. Hill, president of the New Hampshire association; Mrs. Wm. A. Putnam, president of the New York association; Miss Anna Dayton, president of the New Jersey association; Mrs. Herman Hubbard, Ohio; Mrs. Francis J. Bailey, Oregon; Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Roland G. Hazard, Rhode Island; Miss Jane N. Rutherford, Virginia; Mrs. Frank Goodwin, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt, Wisconsin.

AN ADVERTISER'S LOGIC.

Advertisers are not slow to discover the condition of the public pulse. Apropos of this a prominent boy's clothing store starts its advertisement thus:

"Father may save the country once a year at the polls, but mother is saving the country every day, looking after the boys—the country's future citizens."

BALLOTS DO NOT

Watch legislation.
Make mothers intelligent.
Note factory conditions.
Give up-to-date facts.
Stop contagion.
Make budgets.
Detect impure foods and drugs.
Keep babies alive.
Locate housing evils.
Stop child labor.
Clean streets.
Give civic instruction.
Administer justice.
Manage children's courts.
Keep schools clean.
Discover short weights and measures.
Insure decency.
Purchase or audit.
Draw franchises.
Train for citizenship.

"The ballot cannot work 365 days in the year. Government must. The thing which makes officials perform right acts is what the public knows and not the ballot."—William H. Allen, in "Woman's Part in Government."

ARGUMENTS AGAINST SUFFRAGE.

For a minority to force the ballot on an unwilling majority is injustice.

Woman's suffrage to-day means the Socialist party in power.

Women have not begun to grasp their opportunities. Why give them an extra burden?

Women, if in the majority, cannot enforce their decisions.

Our influence is potent because we are non-partizan. Don't give up the substance for the shadow.

The way women are pitching into suffrage means a hold-up of educational and philanthropic work all over the world. Some suffragists even pledge themselves to refuse to do good in other ways until suffrage is won.

GREAT FUN TO BE SUFFRAGETTE.

A woman recently joined a small literary club, and after being in it a while learned it was a suffrage club.

"I don't really care to vote," she added, "but this suffrage is lots of fun. I'm going to hand around literature among the old soldiers Decoration Day. It's a great lark standing around corners and handing around things, and putting 'Votes for Women' on all your letters."

When asked if the club was federated she said, "Oh yes, and we have the cutest president. When she talks to an anti we are only a literary club, but when she talks to a suffragist she comes out strong!"

This woman is fairly wealthy, and has contributed financially to the cause which "is such fun," and is going to California to vote for suffrage at the biennial!

DO WOMEN WANT TO VOTE?

In twenty cities of Massachusetts, where 6,163 women were registered, only 511 women voted. In 174 towns, where 3,127 women were registered, not one woman voted. In 222 towns, including the above, where 7,022 women were registered, only 69 voted on school questions.

A woman, the President of the Massachusetts Equal Suffrage Association, a national suffrage campaigner, was a candidate for member of the School Board in Boston in January, 1912. Strenuous efforts were made to bring out the vote, yet the percentage of women registered in Boston who voted last January was the smallest, with two exceptions, since women first began to vote in 1879. This in face of the fact that Hyde Park had been annexed to Boston and the population had increased 170,000.

These facts speak for themselves.

* * *

Woman's Declaration of Independence, page 70: "The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. . . . He has made her, if married, in the eyes of the law, civilly dead. . . . He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."

Page 72: "Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position."

* * *

A couple of militant suffragettes, after a window-breaking spree, were being taken to jail by an unsympathetic policeman. One of them weakened as she neared the jail. "Never mind, dear," said her companion. "God knows our 'cause' is just, and SHE will take care of us!"

* * *

The suffragist stands aghast when conditions are cited in the suffrage States; with the social evil flourishing like the green bay tree in Denver and Salt Lake City, two of the suffrage strongholds, the suffragists raise the cry: "Give the women the vote, and let them wipe the moral festers from the country!"

* * *

The advance of civilization has been so rapid of late that unless the suffragists hurry, all the reforms they advocate will have been placed upon the statute books by mere man before women get the suffrage.

"Physician, heal thyself," is the answer of the great army of women who oppose the extension of the franchise to women. Make good with your experiment in the suffrage States before you attempt to play with the Government of the nation. Tell us why horse-racing and gambling is legal in Idaho and Utah and illegal in almost every non-suffrage State; tell us why the women members of the Colorado Legislature voted to legalize horse-racing and gambling before you ask us to place the future of the Government in your hands; give us some idea of what you will do with the tariff, the currency and the big problems of the day, and tell us how you expect to clear the air of tuberculosis, the streets of the plague and the world of intemperance before you ask us to hand over to you our Government, to experiment with as you would with a toy.

* * *

Government is a serious business. If women, without any previous training or experience, are going to do better than the men, how are they going to do it; and what apology have they to make for the standard of the manhood of this country if it is so weak and effeminate that it must turn over the affairs of State to the women, that they may show them how to run the Government?

* * *

One of the suffragettes at the recent convention in Louisville delivered herself of the following admonition: "Whatever you do don't be tiresome. Better be vulgar. This is a vulgar age. Be loud; be yellow; be anything to be picturesque. Better go to extremes than bore people."

* * *

During the fourteenth annual convention of the Allgemeinen Frauen Arbeiter Bund of Michigan, which was held recently in Arbeiter Hall, Detroit, with about 100 women delegates in attendance, representing a membership of 3,000, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That we as German women declare ourselves opposed to the extension of the right to vote to the women of the State of Michigan, as we are of the opinion that it would not be to the best interest of the women, nor to the general citizenship of the State, if the women would busy themselves with political affairs."

* * *

With the wages of women lower in the suffrage States than elsewhere, with the child-labor laws far and away behind the more enlightened States, the suffrage enthusiasts cry out: "Give the women the vote, that they may raise the wages of working women and save the children from the grind of ceaseless toil!"

Rev. Anna Shaw says: "I would make motherhood a governmental institution. I would pension all mothers and have them provided for, first to last, by the State. I believe that motherhood should be independent of man."

In their woman's Bible the suffragists object to the reference to the Heavenly Father instead of a Divine Pair!

* * *

During a lively argument in Washington, recently, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, woman suffrage leader, was asked by a certain Congressman: "What has woman ever produced? Just tell me that." "Well," said Dr. Shaw, "the women have produced a lot of men, but that is an achievement that I am loath to mention with too great a degree of pride."

* * *

That women do not want the ballot—the great majority of women—is evidenced upon every hand, even though a few women have started out in an endeavor to purify the home and the State and elevate womanhood, by having themselves nominated as delegates to political conventions, appointed as policemen, etc.

* * *

While there are no doubt a number of men in this country to-day who would make splendid milliners and dressmakers, and while there are some women who would make splendid policemen, we have not yet reached that advanced stage of civilization where we are willing to train the young men of this country as milliners and the young women as policemen.

* * *

The trouble with the suffragists is that they cannot distinguish between a duty and a privilege. They cannot realize that voting is a duty from which women in non-suffrage States have been exempted —not deprived.

* * *

The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage says: "We believe in woman's rights—primarily in her right to be exempt from the responsibility of government. The majority of the women of New York State do not want to vote. They depend upon the men not to thrust suffrage upon them."

* * *

Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCulloch, of Evanston, the only woman justice of the peace in the United States, in a woman suffrage address at Chicago Sunday, denounced Adam as a loafer, painted Eve as the mother of all arts and sciences, and declared that the history of the human race showed that woman was the originator of most of the good things of the world, for which man now takes credit.

Springfield Republican.

The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

(FOUNDED 1895)

PAMPHLETS.

Woman and the Law — *By Francis M. Scott*

Address Before Constitutional Convention, 1894 — *By Hon. Elihu Root*

By Mrs. Francis M. Scott

The Problem of Woman Suffrage — *By Adeline Knapp*

Woman's Rights in America — *By Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin*

A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — *By Miss Emily P. Bissell*

First Address Before the New York Legislature, 1895 — *By Edward W. Bok*

Wages and the Ballot — *By Mary Dean Adams*

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? — *By Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*

Real Opponents to the Suffrage Movement

How Women Can Best Serve the State — *By Mrs. Barclay Hazard*

The Blank Cartridge Ballot — *By Rossiter Johnson*

Taxation and Suffrage — *By Frederick Dwight*

The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *By Prof. Edward D. Cope*

Do Working Women Need the Ballot? — *By Adeline Knapp*

Address—Covering Conditions in Countries Where Limited Woman Suffrage Prevails — *By Mrs. A. J. George*

Woman's Progress Versus Woman Suffrage — *By Helen Kendrick Johnson*

What Women Have Actually Done Where they Vote — *By Richard Barry*

Woman's Relation to Government — *By Mrs. William Forse Scott*

The Inexpediency of Granting Suffrage to American Women — *By Miss Alice Hill Chittenden*

The Legal Status of Women — *By Mrs. Francis M. Scott*

Feminism — *By Prof. Dr. Melchior Palagyi*

Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *By Miss Minnie Bronson*

Woman Suffrage in Finland

New Zealand and Australia from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View

The Voice of the People

Suffragists Desert Philanthropy

Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law.

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 29 West 39th Street, New York City, Engineering Societies Building.

Complete set 50 cts. **Single copies 5 cts.**

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING:

On Suffrage, (.05) — *G. K. Chesterton*

Votes for Women (.10) — *Frederic Harrison*

The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Eliot Seawell*

Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)

Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*

Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to the Woman's Protest.

We recommend to our readers the new Monthly, THE COMMON CAUSE, which is opposed to Socialism. Subscription $2.00. Office, 154 East 23rd Street. Also, THE HOME DEFENDER, Hoquim, Wash.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association opposed to the further extension of suffrage to women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*

Of What Benefit to Woman?

Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*

Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*

Argument Before Committee — *Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells*

Municipal Suffrage for Women. Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*

Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*

The Wage-earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*

Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and Not to Men

Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage

In Opposition to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (a List of Massachusetts Men)

Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association

KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615

687 Boylston Street, - - - - BOSTON, MASS.

The Woman's Protest

.....1912

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years subscription to **The Woman's Protest.**

Name.....

Street.....

City.....*State*.....

Subscription Rate $1.00 a year **Make checks payable to The Woman's Protest**

"Recollections of Elizabeth Benton Fremont,"

Daughter of the "Pathfinder," Genl. John C. Fremont.

A Story of Pioneer Days in the Southwest

By I. T. MARTIN.

By Mail Prepaid, $1.25.

Address I. T. MARTIN,

2979 Decatur Ave., New York City.